

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COLUMBIA DIVISION

Hazelene E. Trexler and Terry A. Trexler,)	C/A NO. 3:09-144-CMC-PJG
)	
Plaintiffs,)	
)	OPINION and ORDER
v.)	
)	
W. Barney Giese; Richland Humane SPCA;)	
Michelle Hart; Kelly Graham; Josh)	
Gowans; Richland Humane SPCA Board)	
Members, individually and as an entity;)	
Dr. Melinda A. Merck; Melanie Brown;)	
Aaron S. Jophlin; Bell Legal Group; Hans)	
Pauling; Dr. Michael R. Privett; Dr. Lari)	
Stokes; Equicare Veterinary Associates;)	
Dr. Kary Carouthers; Wayne Brennessel;)	
Fifth Judicial Circuit Solicitors Office;)	
Jill Andrews Kuppens,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

This matter is before the court on Plaintiffs' *pro se* complaint which alleges violations of their civil rights.

In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 (B)(2)(e), DSC, this matter was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Paige J. Gossett for pre-trial proceedings and a Report and Recommendation ("Report"). On December 18, 2009, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report recommending that Plaintiffs' motion for default judgment (Dkt. #66, filed June 30, 2009) be denied. The Magistrate Judge advised the parties of the procedures and requirements for filing objections to the Report and the serious consequences if they failed to do so. No objections have been filed and the time for doing so has expired.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the court.

See Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of any portion of the Report of the Magistrate Judge to which a specific objection is made. The court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation made by the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). The court reviews the Report only for clear error in the absence of an objection. *See Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a *de novo* review, but instead must only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.”) (citation omitted).

After reviewing the record of this matter, the applicable law, and the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, the court agrees with the conclusions of the Magistrate Judge. Accordingly, the court adopts and incorporates the Report and Recommendation by reference in this Order.

Plaintiffs’ motion for default judgment (Dkt. # 66, filed June 30, 2009) is **denied**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Cameron McGowan Currie
CAMERON MCGOWAN CURRIE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Columbia, South Carolina
January 7, 2010